



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,354	03/16/2006	Jens Hedegaard	037649-3	9370
25570 7590 03/25/2009 ROBERT'S MLOTKOWSKI SAFRAN & COLE, P.C. Intellectual Property Department P.O. Box 10064 MCLEAN, VA 22102-8064				
EXAMINER HURLEY, SHAUN R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3765				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/25/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lgallaugh@rmsclaw.com
dbeltran@rmsclaw.com
bdiaz@rmsclaw.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/572,354

Applicant(s)

HEDEGAARD, JENS

Examiner

Shaun R. Hurley

Art Unit

3765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 50-84 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 78-84 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 50-54 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 55-77 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because as filed, they are faded, blurred, and details illegible. Additionally it appears that pieces of the figures are missing or cutoff. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 51, 57, and 58 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In regards to claim 51, the dependency is incorrect.

In regards to claim 57, are "grooves" the same as "grooving"?

In regards to 58, what grooves? What grooving? Neither is found in claim 53.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hein (3137963).

Hein teaches a hollow distension element pelt board for drying a pelt placed thereon, the pelt board having a longitudinal axis, first and second transverse axes, a front end for engagement with a pelt nose, and a foot end with at least one opening, the pelt board having at least a first and second arched surface with an open structure which define a cavity and substantially symmetrical around the axes, the foot end connected to the cavity, wherein the length of the pelt board evenly decreases, and the front end is rounded (Figures show arched surfaces 18, 22, foot portion 26, the cavity being there between).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hein.

Hein essentially teaches the invention as detailed above, including applying a pelt to the board and allowing the air inside the board to be replaced, but fails to specifically teach securing the pelt on the board with a holding bag, which is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have utilized such a bag, so as to properly hold the pelt in a stretch manner while absorbing fat. Such bags are widely used in pelt drying, and while Hein teaches clothes pins, a well known bag could have been utilized, providing the same degree of stretch retention while allowing for the beneficial fat absorption by the bags, as is known.

7. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horsting (1866709).

Horsting applying a pelt to a hollow distension element pelt board and allowing the air inside the board to be replaced. While he essentially teaches the invention, he fails to specifically teach securing the pelt on the board with a holding bag, which is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have utilized such a bag, so as to properly hold the pelt in a stretch manner while absorbing fat. Such bags are widely used in pelt drying, and while Horsting teaches toggles, a well known bag could have been utilized, providing the same degree of stretch retention while allowing for the beneficial fat absorption by the bags, as is known.

8. Claims 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hein in view of Craggs et al (4389795).

Hein essentially teaches the invention as detailed above, but fails to specifically teach the use of a drying aggregate comprising an encapsulation which has a cavity, with at least one first

opening in connection with a drying pelt so as to exchange air, which Craggs teaches (28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have utilized such a drying aggregate, so as to decrease drying time and increase production. The ordinarily skilled artisan would have appreciated the benefit of quicker drying and known to utilize such a drying aggregate as is known in the art.

9. Claims 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horsting in view of Craggs et al.

Horsting essentially teaches the invention as detailed above, but fails to specifically teach the use of a drying aggregate comprising an encapsulation which has a cavity, with at least one first opening in connection with a drying pelt so as to exchange air, which Craggs teaches (28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have utilized such a drying aggregate, so as to decrease drying time and increase production. The ordinarily skilled artisan would have appreciated the benefit of quicker drying and known to utilize such a drying aggregate as is known in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 55-77 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, as well as any previously mentioned objections.

11. Claims 78-84 are allowed.

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 78 and its dependent claims are found to be allowable because the prior art of record neither teaches nor reasonably suggests the recitations found therein, including the specific encapsulation device having details such as U-shaped profile rails.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. Hedegaard (20030019255) and Bolz (3313038) all teach what is known in the art.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shaun R. Hurley whose telephone number is (571) 272-4986. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:00 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Welch can be reached on (571) 272-4996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shaun R Hurley
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3765

SRH
18 March 2009

/Shaun R Hurley/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3765